

REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10, and 12-20 are pending in the application; claims 6, 9, and 11 are canceled herein.

The applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of certified copies of all the priority document(s), and for acknowledging that the drawings are acceptable.

The specification is amended to correct typographical errors. No new matter is added.

Claims are amended for non-statutory reasons: to correct one or more informalities, remove figure label number(s), and/or to replace European-style claim phraseology with American-style claim language. No new matter is added.

The Office action rejects claims 1-3, 5, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Yanagase et al. (JP 2000-0294831, hereinafter Yanagase). The applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Yanagase teaches a light source that includes a hollow cavity and a light extraction aperture.

Yanagase fails to teach a light extraction device that has a refractive index that substantially matches a refractive index of a solid light guide, and extracts the light by preventing total internal reflection at the surface area in contact with the extraction device, as claimed in independent claim 1, upon which claims 2-4 depend. Independent claims 5 and 8 include similar features.

Because Yanagase fails to teach each of the elements of the applicants' independent claims 1, 5, and 8, the applicants respectfully maintain that claims 1-3, 5, and 8 are patentable over Yanagase, and respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 5, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Yanagase.

The Office action rejects claims 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 12-15, 17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and claims 4, 7, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Zimmerman et al. (USP 6,869,206, hereinafter Zimmerman).

Zimmerman teaches a hollow cavity and a light extraction aperture at which a light extraction device is situated.

Zimmerman fails to teach a light extraction device that has a refractive index that substantially matches a refractive index of a solid light guide, and extracts the light by preventing total internal reflection at the surface area in contact with the extraction device, as claimed in independent claim 1, upon which claims 2-4 depend. Independent claims 5 and 8, upon which claims 7, 10, and 12-20 depend, include similar features.

Because Zimmerman fails to teach each of the elements of the applicants' independent claims 1, 5, and 8, the applicants respectfully maintain that claims 1-5, 7-8, and 10-20 are patentable over Yanagase, and respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of 1-3, 5, 8, 10, 12-15, 17, and 19-20 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and claims 4, 7, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Zimmerman.

In view of the foregoing, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Reg. 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Corporate Counsel
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001